REMARKS

The Non-Final Office Action dated January 15, 2010 has been received and reviewed. Each of claims 1-9, 11-15, 17-26, and 29 stands rejected. Each of claims 1 and 15 are amended as hereinabove set forth, and claims 13-14 and 19-20 have been canceled herein. Reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

A.) Obviousness Rejection Based on Rajan in view of Horvitz

Claims 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2005/0165895 to Rajan, et al. (hereinafter "Rajan") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,161,130 to Horvitz, et al. (hereinafter "Horvitz"). As the Rajan and Horvitz references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of rejected claims 13 and 14, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth. Claims 13 and 14 have been canceled herein, and therefore the 103(a) rejection of these claims is rendered moot.

B.) Obviousness Rejection Based on Rajan, in view of Murray, in further view of Horvitz, and in further view of Adkins

Claims 1-9, 11, 12, 15, 17-26 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajan, in view of U.S. Publication No. 2005/0080855 to Murray (hereinafter "Murray"), in further view of Horvitz, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0243844 to Adkins (hereinafter "Adkins"). Claims 19 and 20 are canceled herein, and therefore the 103(a) rejection of these claims is rendered moot. As the Rajan, Horvitz, Murray,

and Adkins references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of rejected claims 1-9, 11, 12, 15, 17-18, 21-26 and 29, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, is generally directed towards a junk message interface system that facilitates identifying junk messages. More specifically, the system includes a processor for executing a plurality of components, including a message receiving component that collects at least one incoming message, and a filtering component that accepts the incoming message communicated from the message receiving component and determines whether a sender is known or trusted before scanning the message with a filter and determining a junk score for the incoming message. The junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, and is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1. The spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk, wherein once the message has been scored, the message is bucketized based on the determined junk score and tagged with a junk rating which is added as a property on the message. Further, a user can override the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junk score of the message and future messages. The user-based action comprises replying to the message. The components additionally include a verification component that requests confirmation regarding user-initiated actions on rated messages. The system further comprises a display component that renders the junk scores as an actionable property on a user interface to facilitate user management of incoming junk messages communicated from the filtering component.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the Rajan, Murray, Horvitz, or Adkins references teach or suggest the ability of a user to override the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junk score of the message and future messages. To the contrary, Rajan is directed

to moving incoming e-mails into various directories and folders based on whether the e-mails are

"suspected of being spam. . ." Rajan, Abstract. Further, the e-mails are graded as to their level

of spaminess, and are moved or copied "into one or more of the spam directories based upon the

e-mails' respective levels of spaminess." *Id.* In Rajan, as shown in FIG. 3, various folders are

used to store e-mails that may be considered spam. *See id.* at FIG. 3. These folders include a

gray, black, voted spam, and a pre-inbox folder. *See id.* Rajan uses an algorithm to

automatically move e-mails into one or more of the various folders.

As amended, claim 1 recites that the user-based action is a user replying to the

message. The present Office Action, however, cites to Rajan in its rejection of *"wherein a user*

can override the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junks core of the message and

future messages," as recited in claim 1. As amended, however, the user-based action has been

further defined to comprise a user replying to the message that has been determined to be junk.

Rajan, on the other hand, teaches only that a user may vote on the spaminess of an e-mail

message. *See.,* Rajan, ¶ [0032]. The user may be prompted to "take some action such a [sic]

voting on its spaminess." *Id.* Further, Rajan teaches that "if a user votes an email as spam all

email resembling the email that was the subject of the vote is moved from the gray directory to

the black." *Id.* at ¶ [0033]. It is respectfully submitted that Rajan fails to teach or suggest a user-

based action being replying to a message, such that replying to a junk message would trigger an

override of the current junk score.

Further, as mentioned above, Rajan teaches only that a user can manually override

a current spaminess rating by voting. This is an explicit override of a score. Independent claim

1, however, describes a user-based action as being used to override a score. This is not an

explicit override, but is an action that is made by a user to help the system understand how to

score e-mails in the future. In addition to Rajan, Murry, Horvitz, and Adkins also fail to teach or suggest the above-recited feature, as none of these references teaches overriding a junk score by a user replying to a messages that has been categorized as junk.

Additionally, the verification component of independent claim 1 *"requests confirmation regarding the user-based actions on rated messages."* As mentioned above, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the user-based actions are replies to the messages that have been rated as junk. The present Office Action cites to Adkins for its rejection of *"a verification component that requests confirmation regarding user-initiated actions on rated messages. . ."* The Adkins reference, to the contrary, is directed to filtering incoming e-mail messages based on the sender of the e-mail, such that there are inclusive, temporary, and exclusive address books that list various names used for sorting and filtering the incoming e-mail messages. *See,* Adkins, Abstract. More particularly, Adkins teaches that "[a] user attempting to inspect the contents of an 'exclusive to' interesting sender's message can be warned that the message is 'unacceptable,' why, that it is very likely 'spam,' and that they are strongly advised NOT to open it unless they recognize the sender's email address." *Id.* at ¶ [0176]. While this does mention a warning message, it is not a warning message based on a user-based action, wherein the user-based action is a user replying to a message, not simply viewing a message. As such, Adkins fails to teach or suggest the above-recited feature of independent claim 1, as amended herein. In addition to Adkins, Rajan, Murry, and Horvitz also fail to teach or suggest the above-recited feature, as none of these references teach or suggest a verification component that provides a warning messages that is based on a user replying to a message categorized as junk.

Claims 2-9, 11-12, and 29 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, as amended herein, and therefore for at least the reasons stated above with respect to

claim 1, are patentable over Rajan, Murry, Horvitz, and Adkins. As such, claims 2-9, 11-12, and 29 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 15, as amended herein, is directed towards a method that facilitates identification of junk messages in a user's inbox. The method includes employing a processor to execute the identification of junk messages, which comprises receiving a plurality of incoming messages, determining whether a sender is known or trusted, and assigning a junk rating to the messages. Further, the method includes exposing at least the junk rating on a user interface, and calculating a junk score for substantially all incoming messages, the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk. Additionally, the method includes bucketizing the message based on the calculated junk score, and tagging the message with a junk rating which is added as a property on the message. Also, the method includes determining whether at least one of the junk score or the junk rating exceed a first threshold and removing messages that exceed the first threshold to mitigate inadvertent access of them by the user. The messages that exceed the first threshold are removed before they are viewable on the user interface. Further, the method includes overriding the junk score via a user-based action that affects the junk score of the message and future message. A confirmation is presented regarding the user-based action on the message, the user-based action including one or more of modifying or replying to the message.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the Rajan, Murray, Horvitz, or Adkins references teach or suggest *"determining whether at least one of the junk score or the junk rating exceed a first threshold and removing messages that exceed the first threshold to mitigate*

3854839 v1

inadvertent access of them by the user, wherein the messages that exceed the first threshold are removed before they are viewable on the user interface." The present Office Action cites to Rajan in rejecting claim 20, which has been canceled herein and the feature previously claimed has been incorporated into independent claim 15. In particular, the Office Action states that "Rajan discloses grading the e-nail according to the level of spaminess and then moving the e-mail into the appropriately labeled directory." Office Action, p. 18. This, however, makes no mention as to the e-mail being removed before it is viewable on the user interface. In fact, it teaches just the opposite, in that the e-mail appears in the inbox, is then graded, and then moved to the appropriate folder. It is respectfully submitted that simply stating that Rajan purportedly teaches that e-mails are graded and then moved into "the appropriately labeled directory" is not enough to reject this feature of claim 15, as amended herein. Rajan at ¶ [0017]. In claim 15, the e-mail is not even visible in the inbox before it is moved or otherwise deleted so that the user does not confuse a spam e-mail with any other non-spam e-mail, such as one having a lower junk rating than an e-mail that is likely to contain spam. This is important in that it provides an enormous benefit to the user, such as the user not mistakenly opening or replying to an e-mail that is likely to contain spam. It is respectfully submitted that the Murray, Horvitz, and Adkins references also do not disclose this feature of independent claim 15, as amended herein.

Claims 17-18, 21-26 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, as amended herein, and therefore for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, are patentable over Rajan, Murry, Horvitz, and Adkins. As such, claims 17-18, 21-26 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-9, 11-12, 15, 17-18, 21-26, and 29 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or emcfarland@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/ELENA K. McFARLAND/

Elena K. McFarland
Reg. No. 59,320

EKM/nlh
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO   64108-2613
816-474-6550

3854839 v1